

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/852,958	SIRBASKU, DAVID A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alana M. Harris, Ph.D.	1642	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alana M. Harris, Ph.D. (3) _____

(2) Carol G. Mintz. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 14 June 0204.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-108.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner called Applicants' representative, Ms. Mintz to ask whether or not the instant application had been abandoned. Ms. Mintz responded that Applicants did respond to the Restriction/Election requirement mailed October 3, 2003, however could not determine if the paperwork had indeed been faxed and did not have confirmation of such and never received a dated postcard receipt from USPTO verifying receipt of the response in question. The Examiner relayed to Ms. Mintz that the case was abandoned and she could file a petition requesting revival of application .